

JULIA M. JAYNE, State Bar No. 202753
Jayne Law Group, P.C.
483 9th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: 415-623-3600
Facsimile: 415-623-3605
julia@jaynelawgroup.com

Attorney for Defendant JONATHAN CHANG

CHRISTOPHER J. CANNON, State Bar No. 88034
Sugarman & Cannon
737 Tehama Street, No. 3
San Francisco, CA 94103
Telephone: 415-362-6252
Facsimile: 415-362-6431
chris@sugarmanandcannon.com

Attorneys for Defendant WEILIN CHANG

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JONATHAN CHANG & WEILIN CHANG ,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cr-00047 EJD

**DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED JURY
QUESTIONNAIRE**

Pretrial Conference: July 31, 2019
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept: Courtroom 1, 5th Floor
Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Date Filed: July 3, 2019

Trial Date: August 13, 2019

Defendants Jonathan and Weilin Chang submit the following juror questionnaire.¹

This questionnaire is being submitted by defendants, as is common practice in the

¹ The defense offered to submit this as a joint questionnaire, but the government declined.

1 Northern District of California;² most such questionnaires include a wide range of questions
 2 about the jurors' backgrounds and interests, including race or ethnicity-related questions.³

3 Defendants propose that on a date selected by the Court, prospective jurors fill out
 4 questionnaires, the parties be given time to review questionnaires and if agreement can be
 5 reached by the parties from reviewing the questionnaires about jurors who should be stuck for
 6 cause and not questioned further, the parties would notify the court. The remaining jurors would
 7 then be subject to the Court's standard *voir dire* on any juror questionnaire responses that require
 8 further questioning of the jurors and, if the Court permits, brief attorney *voir dire* of the jurors.
 9 Defendants believe this is the most expeditious way to learn information about the prospective
 10 jurors.

11 According, Defendants request that this Court distribute the attached questionnaire to all
 12 potential jurors.

13 Dated: July 11, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

14 _____
 15 /s/

16 Julia Jayne

17 Christopher J. Cannon

18 Attorneys for Defendants Jonathan & Weilin Chang
 19
 20
 21
 22

23 ² Similar juror questionnaires have been provided in the following N.D.C.A. cases: *United States v. Williams*, 13-
 24 0764 WHO (RICO and related charges); *United States v. Berger*, 17-00491-RS, Dkt. 99 (tax fraud); *United States v.*
 25 *Bogucki*, 18-0021-CRB, Dkt. 160 (wire fraud); *United States v. McKean and Burch*, 17-00175 CRB, Dkt. 327-1
 (conspiracy to defraud U.S.); *United States v. Meli Lin et al*, 15-0065-BLF, Dkt. 188 (tax fraud).

26 ³ The Supreme Court has recognized the importance of juror questions regarding race, *Ristaino v. Ross*, 424 U.S.
 27 589 (1976), and has held that it is required in Capital cases. *Turner v. Murray*, 476 US. 28 (1986). In these
 28 polarized times where immigration is on the front page daily, it is hard to imagine a case where questionnaire or voir
 dire on the subject of racial prejudice and immigration would not be required in a case with non-white defendants.